

### **REMARKS**

The Official Action dated 01 April 2004 has been carefully considered, along with cited references.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garfinkel et al. in view of Toby.

However, the Examiner has kindly indicated that claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, claim 6 which is indicated to be allowable has been deleted, and has been included into claim 1. Claims 4 and 5 to which claim 6 is dependent thereon have also been deleted and have also been included into claim 1. Claim 2 is dependent on the amended claim 1. Claim 3 is dependent on claim 2.

Accordingly, claims 1-3 would appear to be allowable, and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly most respectfully solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner SCHWARTZ are appreciated.

respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

CHARLES E. BAXLEY

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor

New York, N.Y. 10038

TEL: (212) 791-7200

FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.